

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed on December 18, 2007. It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this Response, however, the Director is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-61 on the account statement.

Claims 27-35 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, Claims 27, 29-32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2003/0135852 to Kamemoto (“*Kamemoto*”) in view of US Patent No. 6,177,931 to Alexander et al. (“*Alexander*”) in further view of US Patent No. 6,510,553 to Hazra (“*Hazra*”). Claims 28, 33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kamemoto* in view of *Alexander* and *Hazra* in further view of US Patent No. 6,064,376 to Berezowski et al. (“*Berezowski*”). In response, Claims 27 and 32 have been amended and Claims 36-41 have been added. The amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 27 and 32 to recite, in part, the first transmission path including a ground-wave broadcast and the second transmission path including a communication satellite broadcast. Support for the amendment can be found in Applicants’ specification. For example, at page 14, lines 1-5, Applicants disclose that the supplemental broadcast can be based on a satellite link separate from a ground-wave transmission of the main broadcast. Further, at page 14, lines 13-16, Applicants disclose an advantage of using satellite communication for broadcasting the supplementary information, *i.e.*, satellite communication channels have a wide transmission band for including huge video and audio data. Also, it is possible to enhance the quality of a popular television program and the effectiveness of the supplementary information by allotting many frequency bands to the supplemental broadcast via channels of a communication satellite broadcast. See, specification, page 23, lines 8-19.

Applicants have further amended independent Claims 27 and 32 to recite, in part, the step of controlling the display to absolve a user from switching between the ground-wave and satellite broadcasts. Support for the amendment can be found in Applicants’ specification, for example,

at page 10, lines 9-14. Applicants disclose that the main programs of the ground-wave broadcast channels and the symbolic labels can be displayed together. See, specification, page 28, lines 3-8. A viewer who does not know the channel of the CS broadcast can simply select a symbolic label displayed on the display unit. See, specification, page 12, lines 17-23. The viewer can easily return to the main program after watching the supplemental program. See, specification, page 12, line 24 to page 13, line 1. This information processing method uses frequency bands more efficiently and lowers operation costs. See, specification, page 21, lines 5-8.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of Claims 27, 29-32 and 34 in view of *Kamemoto*, *Alexander*, and *Hazra*, Applicants respectfully submit that, even if combinable, all of the claimed elements are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Kamemoto fails to disclose or suggest the second transmission path including a communication satellite broadcast as recited in Claims 27 and 32 as amended. In contrast, *Kamemoto* discloses the use of a high frequency RF television signal and a modem. See, *Kamemoto*, paragraphs [0034] and [0036]. Thus, *Kamemoto* suggests cable and terrestrial television broadcasting and does not disclose communication satellite broadcasting as currently claimed. Further, *Alexander* and *Hazra* fail to cure the deficiencies of *Kamemoto*. Instead, the disclosures of *Alexander* and *Hazra* are silent with respect to a second transmission path including a communication satellite broadcast as currently claimed. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 27 and 32 as amended are novel, nonobvious and distinguishable from *Kamemoto*, *Alexander*, and *Hazra*.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of Claims 28, 33 and 35 in view of *Kamemoto*, *Alexander*, *Hazra*, and *Berezowski*, Applicants respectfully submit that *Berezowski* fails to cure the deficiencies of the previously cited references.

Berezowski fails to disclose or suggest a first reception means which receives television programs via a first transmission path, the first transmission path including a ground-wave broadcast as presently claimed. *Berezowski* also fails to disclose controlling the display to absolve a user from switching between ground-wave and satellite broadcasts as presently claimed. Instead, the emphasis of *Berezowski* is drawn to a program guide channel system showing promotional information, e.g., advertisements, and program listings. See, *Berezowski*, Abstract. In other words, *Berezowski* does not disclose displaying actual television programs

transmitted via ground-wave broadcasts. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are novel, nonobvious and distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections with respect to Claims 27-35 be reconsidered and the rejections be withdrawn.

Applicants further note that Claims 36-41 have been newly added. Applicants respectfully submit that the newly added claims are fully supported in the specification. For example, new Claims 36 and 39 are supported at page 21, line 9, to page 22, line 3; new Claims 37 and 40 are supported at page 22, lines 4-13; and new Claims 38 and 41 are supported at page 17, lines 20-24. Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter as defined in the newly added claims is patentable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above, and for the additional patentable elements recited therein.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY


Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 29175

Dated: February 26, 2008